

# 2026 Rule of Law Report - targeted stakeholder consultation

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

The annual Rule of Law Report lies at the centre of the Annual Rule of Law Cycle, which acts as a preventive tool, deepening multilateral dialogue and joint awareness of rule of law issues. So far, six editions of the Rule of Law Report have been published since 2020.

As every year, the Commission would like to invite the stakeholders to provide contributions to the 2026 Rule of Law Report. On the basis of these contributions and on-going developments, further targeted questions may be shared at a later stage of preparation of the 2026 Rule of Law Report, in particular in the context of country visits, or bilateral contacts.

The Commission invites stakeholders to provide contributions which include:

**(1) developments and measures taken in relation to the recommendations in the 2025 report,**  
**(2) developments related to topics covered in the 2025 country chapters, as well as any other new developments related to the rule of law.**

The input should consist of a short summary, if possible in English, covering the areas referred to below. Legislation or other documents may be referenced with a link. Contributions should focus on significant developments since the last Rule of Law Report both as regards the legal framework and its implementation in practice.

This questionnaire also integrates the separate questionnaire on the single market from last year. In addition to these specific questions, respondents to the questionnaire are invited to consider the Single Market dimension, including any relevant cross-border issues, in all their answers.

**Where questions of particular relevance under the single market dimension, this is indicated before the relevant question.**

[1] Unless the information was already submitted in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

## **Type of information to be included:**

Under each of the four pillars, the replies should include references to the following types of information:

### **A) Legislative developments**

- Newly adopted legislation
- legislative drafts currently discussed in Parliament
- legislative plans envisaged by the Government

### **B) Policy developments**

- Implementation and enforcement of legislation
- evaluations, impact assessment, surveys
- white papers/strategies/actions plans/consultation processes
- follow-up to reports/recommendations of Council of Europe bodies or other international organisations
- important administrative measures
- generalised practices

### **C) Developments related to the judiciary / independent authorities**

- important case law by national courts
- important decision/opinions from independent bodies/authorities
- state of play on terms, nominations and expired mandates for high-level positions (e.g. Supreme Court, Constitutional Court, Council for the Judiciary, Prosecutor General, heads of independent authorities included in the scope of the request for input[2])

### **D) Any other relevant developments**

- National authorities are free to add any further information, which they deem relevant; however, this should be short and to the point.

Where relevant, please also indicate whether the developments reported are linked to the implementation of reforms and investments under the national Recovery Resilience Plan. To simplify your answers to the questionnaire, if there are no developments, it is sufficient to indicate this and the information covered in the contributions for the previous Rule of Law Reports does not need not be repeated.

[2] Such as: media regulatory authorities and bodies, national human rights institutions, equality bodies, ombudsman institutions, supreme audit institutions and, where they exist, transparency authorities.

\* I am giving my contribution as

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☐ Civil society organisation/NGO
- ☐ International organisation
- ☒ Judicial association or network
- ☐ Media organisation or association
- ☐ Public authority or network of public authorities
- ☐ Other

\* Organisation name

*250 character(s) maximum*

Medel (Magistrats Européens pour la Démocratie et les Libertés)

Main Areas of Work

- ☒ Justice System
- ☐ Anti-corruption
- ☐ Media Pluralism and Freedom
- ☐ Checks and Balances
- ☐ Other

Please insert an URL towards your organisation's main online presence or describe your organisation briefly:

*500 character(s) maximum*

<https://medelnet.eu>; <https://www.facebook.com/medel.europe.3>; <https://x.com/MedelEurope>;  
@medeleurope.bsky.social

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is in the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making

981119221130-18

\* Country of origin

Please indicate the country of origin of your organisation

- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☒ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Slovak Republic
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden
- ☐ Other - please specify

First name

Mariarosaria

Surname

Guglielmi

Email Address of the organisation

office@medelnet.eu

**\* Publication of your contribution and privacy settings**

You can choose whether you wish for your contribution to be published and whether you wish your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- ☐ Anonymous - Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. Organisation name, URL, transparency register number, first name and surname given above will not be published. **To maintain anonymity, please refrain from mentioning the name of your organisation and any details from which your organisation can be identified in the rest of your contribution as we will not be able to guarantee anonymisation of these elements.**
- ☒ Public - Your personal details (name, organisation name, transparency register number, country of origin will be published with your contribution).
- ☐ No publication - Your contribution will not be published. Elements of your contribution may be referred to anonymously in documents produced by the Commission based on this consultation.

☒ I agree with the personal data protection provisions.

[Specific privacy statement targeted stakeholder consultation 2026 rule of law report.pdf](#)

## Questions on horizontal developments

---

In this section, you are invited to provide information on general horizontal developments or trends, both positive and negative, covering all or several Member States. In particular, you could mention issues that are common to several Member States, as well as best practices identified in one Member State that could be replicated. Moreover, you could refer to your activities in the area of the four pillars and sub-topics (an overview of all sub-topics can be found below), and, if you represent a Network of national organisations, to the support you might have provided to one of your national members.

## Overview topics for contribution

[List of topics for contribution.docx](#)

## Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

Most of the alerts contained in the 2025 contribution are still completely valid and furthermore aggravated by the latest developments relating to the global wave of autocratization and global attacks on Rule of law values. Developments threatening judicial independence are part of a broader context, that is calling into question the very principle of the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances (see ENCJ statement of June 4, 2025 [https://pgwrk-websitemedia.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/production/pwk-web-encj2017-p/Declaration%20of%20Riga%20\\_final.pdf](https://pgwrk-websitemedia.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/production/pwk-web-encj2017-p/Declaration%20of%20Riga%20_final.pdf) ), and include: -an increasing intolerance towards the judiciary for its role as impartial guarantor of fundamental rights and for its power to review the legality of the actions of the executive; this trend is particularly evident in certain national contexts where the main targets of such intolerance are judges dealing with migration cases, following their decisions which, although referring to supranational sources to protect individuals, are considered arbitrary as they are not in line with restrictive national policies and national interests; -political criticism of judicial decisions and populist rhetoric, questioning the democratic legitimacy of the judiciary and the impartiality of judges and prosecutors by accusing them to play a political role; -attacks and delegitimization affecting as well the role that national judges play as European judges, in reaffirming the primacy of EU law and supranational sources; part of the same trend is the non – compliance with CJEU judgments and the persistent non-compliance or incomplete implementation of ECtHR judgments; - the failure to implement decisions contrary to the government's position, the lack of adequate consultation with the judiciary on relevant draft legislation, and the implementation of reforms without the consent of the judiciary (see ENCJ stat.); - informal court-curbing policies and structural and constitutional reforms aimed at weakening judicial systems and their key institutions, such as High Councils and Prosecution services, supported by aggressive media campaigns, led also by high profile politicians, producing a distorting mirror image of the judiciary;- on the grounds that it compromises the impartiality and political neutrality of the judiciary, the attempt to limit the freedom of speech and association of judges, prosecutors and their associations; - smear campaigns, profiling and doxing attacks against individual magistrates.

MEDEL reiterated its interventions in support of the judiciary and judicial associations in different contexts: denouncing the risk of a dangerous delegitimization of the judiciary and the prejudice to the trust of the citizens in its impartiality and fairness and in its effective role of impartial guarantor of fundamental rights (<https://medelnet.eu/medel-statement-on-romania/>; <https://medelnet.eu/statement-on-the-recent-attacks-on-the-french-judiciary/> ); the necessity to adequately address systemic deficiencies that jeopardize the independence of the judiciary ( <https://medelnet.eu/medel-statement-on-moldova/> ); the serious risks to the Rule of law posed by a radical revision of the constitutional framework and the guarantees it provides for key institutions such as the public prosecutor and the Superior Council for the Judiciary; ( <https://medelnet.eu/solidarity-with-all-italian-magistrates-and-the-associazione-nazionale-magistrati/>; <https://medelnet.eu/statement-on-constitutional-reform-of-the-judiciary-in-italy/> ) ; the risks related to the globalisation of attacks on democracy, international law, international humanitarian law, supranational judicial institutions - such as the International Criminal Court - against the backdrop of mass human rights violation ( <https://medelnet.eu/eu-should-defend-the-icc/> ; [https://medelnet.eu/medel-stands-in-support-of-the-international-criminal-court-and-in-solidarity-with-its-officials/#\\_ftn1](https://medelnet.eu/medel-stands-in-support-of-the-international-criminal-court-and-in-solidarity-with-its-officials/#_ftn1); <https://medelnet.eu/medel-stands-in-support-of-the-international-criminal-court-and-in-solidarity-with-its-officials/>)

Medel focused on pressure against the judiciary organizing conferences on these topics, involving academics and judicial associations: <https://medelnet.eu/international-conference-berlin-28-february-2025/> ; <https://medelnet.eu/international-conference-next-ca-of-medel-athens-november-21st-22nd-2025/>; <https://medelnet.eu/the-backsliding-of-the-rule-of-law-and-the-pressure-exerted-on-the-judiciary-in-europe-the-role-of-the-european-union-international-conference-athens-21-november-2025/>; <https://medelnet.eu/judges-in-the-crisis-of-democracies-florence-29-11-2025/>

## Questions for contribution

Under each pillar, you are invited to provide information on measures taken to implement the recommendations addressed to the Member State in the 2025 Rule of Law report, as well as developments with regard to the points raised in the respective country chapter of the 2025 Rule of Law Report and any other significant developments since January 2025 and up to the date of submission<sup>[3]</sup>. Please always include a link to and reference relevant legislation/documents (in the national language and/or where available, in English). **Significant developments** can include challenges, positive developments and best practices, covering both legislative developments or implementation and practices.

Information provided in reply to the first question under each pillar, related to the follow-up to the recommendations, does not need to be repeated in subsequent parts of the questionnaire, but can be cross-referenced in the subsequent questions, where relevant. All other questions are not limited to the recommendations, but as in previous years, cover the entire scope of the Report.

[3] Unless already covered in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

Member State/enlargement country covered in contribution [only one choice possible]

**If you wish to submit information concerning several Member States/enlargement countries, please fill in the questionnaire separately for each country. There is no limit to the number of contributions submitted by a single participant.**

- ☐ Albania
- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy

- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Montenegro
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ North Macedonia
- ☒ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Serbia
- ☐ Slovakia
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden

## I. Justice System

---

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the justice system (if applicable)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

The Council of Ministers adopted 2 draft bills submitted by the Minister of Justice. 2 of them are key legislative acts concerning the status of judges appointed with the participation of the National Council of the Judiciary (KRS) and the rules governing the functioning of the KRS.<sup>1)</sup> Draft bills concerning the status of so-called neo-judges and the restoration of the Council of the Judiciary. The draft bills addressing the status of neo-judges and the reform of the Council constitute the foundation of a legislative rule of law package intended to restore the constitutional order in the administration of justice. The purpose of the proposed act is to regulate the status of judges appointed with the participation of the Council of the Judiciary operating between 7.3.18 and 13.5.26 and, as a consequence, to guarantee participants in judicial proceedings the full enjoyment of the right to have their cases examined by an independent, impartial and properly appointed court, as well as legal certainty as regards the finality of judicial decisions. The draft provides for the invalidation of KRS resolutions adopted during that period which included motions for appointment to judicial office (with the exception of motions concerning the group of so-called entry-level judges). Persons who, immediately prior to their appointment as judges on the basis of resolutions of the improperly constituted KRS, held another judicial office will return to that position. Until new competitions are conducted, they will be delegated to perform judicial duties in their current court (with the exception of the Supreme Court). Persons who were not judges prior to their appointment will be able to return to their previously practised profession (e.g. prosecutor, advocate) or take up the position of court referendary. The judicial posts occupied by such persons will become vacant on the date the act enters into force, and new competitions will be conducted for those positions.

The draft provides that judgments delivered with the participation of judges appointed upon the motion of the KRS operating between 7.3.18 and 13.5.26 will remain in force, while granting the parties to those proceedings a limited right to seek the reopening of proceedings (provided that they raised an objection concerning the improper composition of the court during the proceedings).

In addition, the proposed act introduces changes to the Supreme Court, including: the abolition of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber; the abolition of the institution of the extraordinary complaint; a change in the method of selecting judges adjudicating in the Professional Responsibility Chamber, removing the influence of the executive branch on the composition of that chamber. As a rule, the new provisions are to enter into force 30 days after their publication in the Journal of Laws.

Draft of the act: Druk nr 2107-Sejm Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej

2) Draft Act amending the Act on the National Council of the Judiciary and the Electoral Code. The draft act amends the rules for the election of judges to the National Council of the Judiciary in order to restore their compliance with the Constitution of the Republic of Poland and with the judgments of Polish and European courts. Those rulings indicated that the current method of selecting the composition of the KRS does not ensure sufficient independence of the judiciary from the legislative and executive branches.

The draft provides that 15 judicial members of the KRS will be elected in direct and secret elections by all judges, rather than by the Sejm. Representation of all types and levels of courts is to be ensured, and mechanisms conducive to political influence in the judicial appointment process (in which the assessment of candidates by the KRS is of key importance) are to be eliminated.

Candidates will be judges with at least ten years of service as a judge, including at least five years in the court in which they currently adjudicate. Mandates are allocated proportionally to the number of judges in individual courts: 1 judge of the Supreme Court, 2 appellate judges, 3 regional court judges, 6 district court judges, and 1 judge each from the military courts, the Supreme Administrative Court and the Voivodeship Administrative Courts. The National Electoral Commission (PKW) is the body responsible for organising and conducting the elections: the PKW verifies candidate nominations in formal and legal terms and prepares ballot papers; elections are conducted by counting committees in individual courts, and votes are cast on ballot papers; each voter may cast a maximum of 15 votes (1 vote for each seat in the KRS to be filled by a judge); the PKW organises a public hearing, which is recorded and broadcast live; electoral protests are examined by the Supreme Administrative Court. The new provisions are to enter into force 14 days after their publication in the Journal of Laws. Druk nr 2108 -Sejm Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej

## A. Independence

### Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)

*(The reference to 'judges' concerns judges at all level and types of courts as well as judges at constitutional courts)*

*5000 character(s) maximum*

### Irremovability of judges, including transfers, (incl. as part of judicial map reform), dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

The Ministry of Justice has presented a draft Act amending the Law on the System of Common Courts. The proposal has been classified as a priority legislative project, and its main objective is to adapt the regulations to the needs of judicial practice and to increase the efficiency of the administration of justice.

The draft focuses on issues relating to the professional status of judges, in particular:

1. the rules governing the continuation of judicial service after reaching retirement age;
2. regulations concerning the secondment of judges, including to non-adjudicatory duties.

The new provisions are intended to allow judges to continue in service after reaching the retirement age of 65, provided that no later than six months before that date they submit a declaration of their intention to remain in office and present a medical certificate confirming their fitness for work. In such cases, a judge would be able to adjudicate until the age of 70, without the need to obtain the consent of any administrative authority.

The National Council of the Judiciary is to be excluded from the procedure, and the role of the Minister of Justice is to be limited to receiving the relevant documents, without any decision-making powers in this regard. An important element of the draft is the introduction of the possibility to reduce the workload of judges who have reached the age of 65 and wish to continue adjudicating. Under the proposal, a judge would be able to determine a reduced share in the allocation of cases, ranging from 25% to 75% of a full workload.

This solution is intended to relieve older judges who, due to age or workload intensity, are no longer able to maintain a full pace of adjudication, while still remaining a valuable asset to the courts. The remuneration system is to be adjusted accordingly: judges working under this model would receive a portion of their salary and a proportional part of the retirement benefit to which they would otherwise be entitled.

Another significant change concerns the secondment of judges to non-adjudicatory work, for example within the Ministry of Justice or other institutions subordinate to the Ministry. At present, such secondments may last for many years, effectively excluding judges from adjudicating.

The draft act provides that the total duration of non-adjudicatory secondments may not exceed four years. After this period, a judge would be required to return to adjudication for a period at least equal to the length of the secondment (or its cumulative duration), but not shorter than one year. According to the explanatory memorandum, secondments should be exceptional and temporary in nature, serving to provide substantive support for specific tasks, rather than functioning as a means of compensating for staffing shortages in public administration.

The planned date for the adoption of the draft by the Council of Ministers is the first quarter of 2026.

### Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

## Allocation of cases in courts

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence (including composition and nomination and dismissal of its members), and powers of the body tasked with safeguarding the independence of the judiciary (e.g. Council for the Judiciary)

5000 character(s) maximum

Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal/civil (where applicable) liability of judges (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

By a decision of 4 April 2025, the Minister of Justice dismissed Judge Przemysław W. Radzik from the position of Deputy Disciplinary Commissioner for Judges of the Ordinary Courts. Subsequently, by a decision of 15 September 2025, the Minister of Justice appointed Judge Joanna Halina Raczowska of the District Court for Warsaw-Mokotów in Warsaw to that position.

Since then, the Disciplinary Commissioner, Judge Joanna Halina Raczowska, acting pursuant to Article 112 §§ 6 and 7 of the Law on the System of Common Courts, has been appointing local deputy disciplinary commissioners.

For example: on 3 November 2025, the Disciplinary Commissioner for Judges of the Ordinary Courts decided to dismiss six judges from the positions of Deputy Disciplinary Commissioners at Regional Courts and Deputy Disciplinary Commissioner at the Court of Appeal. The reasoning for this decision included allegations concerning actions taken while performing those functions which raise serious doubts as to their legitimacy and lawfulness. In addition, with respect to two further Deputy Disciplinary Commissioners—one at a Regional Court and one at a Court of Appeal—the ineffectiveness of their appointments was established.

Pursuant to Article 112 § 7 "a contrario" of the Act of 27 July 2001 – Law on the System of Common Courts (Journal of Laws of 2024, item 334; hereinafter: "LSCC"), and after obtaining favourable opinions from the competent judicial councils, the Disciplinary Commissioner for Judges of the Ordinary Courts dismissed the following persons from their functions as Deputy Disciplinary Commissioners at Regional Courts and at the Court of Appeal.

The principal reasons indicated in the dismissal decisions included:

- a lack of acceptance within the judicial community for the attitude and activities of these judges in their capacity as Deputy Disciplinary Commissioners;
- pending and conducted disciplinary proceedings (Judges Anna Gąsior-Majchrowska, Jakub Iwaniec, Mirosława Chyr-Brzeszczak, Kamila Borszowska-Moszowska, Jarosław Dudzicz), a request by a regional court council to undertake explanatory actions (Judge Jarosław Wodzyński), and proceedings concerning the lifting of judicial immunity (Judge Jakub Iwaniec);
- participation in judicial nomination procedures before the National Council of the Judiciary as constituted under the Act of 8 December 2017 amending the Act on the National Council of the Judiciary and certain other acts (Journal of Laws 2018, item 3), i.e. a body established in breach of the Constitution of the Republic of Poland, dependent on the executive branch and failing to fulfil its role of safeguarding the independence of courts and judges and of conducting objective, reliable and transparent assessments of candidates for judicial office (Judges Anna Gąsior-Majchrowska, Kamila Borszowska-Moszowska, Mirosława Chyr-Brzeszczak, Jarosław Wodzyński, Adam Jaworski, Jarosław Dudzicz), as a consequence of which judgments issued by these judges were set aside (Judge Anna Gąsior-Majchrowska) or they were excluded from adjudicating cases (Judges Mirosława Chyr-Brzeszczak, Adam Jaworski);
- participation in the procedure of signing lists of support for candidates to the improperly constituted National Council of the Judiciary (Judges Anna Gąsior-Majchrowska, Jakub Iwaniec, Jarosław Dudzicz), as well as participation in the improperly constituted National Council of the Judiciary itself (Judge Jarosław Dudzicz).

## Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service

*5000 character(s) maximum*

## Independence of the Bar (chamber/association of lawyers) and of lawyers

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Significant developments capable of affecting the perception that the general public has of the independence of the judiciary

*5000 character(s) maximum*

## B. Quality of justice

*(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined in the introduction)*

**[single market relevance]** Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Amendments to the legislation, entering into force on 1 January 2026, facilitate citizens' access to free legal support. The programme is addressed to persons whose life circumstances prevent them from covering the costs of paid legal assistance.

Easier access to free legal aid and free civic counselling

The new regulations significantly improve access to free legal aid by increasing flexibility through year-round remote consultations and enhanced facilities for persons with disabilities.

The main changes include the systematisation of remote support, facilitation for persons with disabilities, and procedural improvements. The introduced solutions will not only make access to legal aid easier for citizens, but will also allow for more effective use of duty hours at free legal aid points.

Key changes in remote support

- Permanent remote access: advice by telephone, e-mail or video call available throughout the year, no longer limited to states of emergency;
- Choice of form at registration: applicants indicate their preferred method – in person or remotely; in special cases, they specify available remote means and justify a visit outside the point;
- Oral declaration: an oral statement confirming the inability to cover the costs of paid legal assistance is sufficient for remote consultations; in-person consultations require a written declaration;
- Referral: where a remote consultation requires document analysis, the beneficiary will be referred (registered) for an in-person appointment at a stationary point or to the district governor competent for the place of residence, with a recommendation to visit the nearest point.

Persons with severe mobility impairments or communication difficulties will be able to receive free legal aid or civic counselling also outside the point:

- at the person's place of residence;
- in premises equipped with communication-support devices;
- with the assistance of a sign language interpreter;
- or in another suitably adapted location.

Prior to such a visit, remote contact may take place during which the lawyer or adviser collects the required declaration. Legal aid points will provide headsets with microphones and clear information on remote options and procedures for persons in difficult situations, including how to request a visit outside the point.

The system covers civic counselling, legal aid and mediation, available at approximately 1,500 points in all districts of Poland, regardless of the place of residence. Assistance is provided by lawyers – advocates and legal advisers – as well as by non-governmental organisations.

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material), remuneration/bonuses/rewards for judges and prosecutors, including observed changes (significant and targeted increase or decrease over the past year)

*(Material resources refer e.g. to court buildings and other facilities. Financial resources include salaries of staff in courts and prosecution offices.)*

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**[single market relevance]** Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff, clerks/trainees)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, including electronic communication and AI tools, within the justice system and with court users, procedural rules, access to judgments online)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Use of assessment tools and standards (e.g. ICT systems, including AI-based systems, for case management, court statistics and their transparency, monitoring, evaluation, surveys among court users or legal professionals)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Geographical distribution and number of courts/jurisdictions (“judicial map”) and their specialisation, in particular specific courts or chambers within courts to deal with fraud and corruption cases.

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**[single market relevance]** Specialisation (of judges/specific courts/chambers within courts) and training for the judiciary to deal with commercial cases, as well as alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and mediation as regards commercial cases.

*5000 character(s) maximum*

## C. Efficiency of the justice system

*(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined in the introduction)*

**[single market relevance]** Developments related to efforts to improve the efficiency of the justice system (e.g. as regards length of proceedings, to address backlogs)

5000 character(s) maximum

### Any other developments related to the justice system - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

RoL report 2025-Recommendations

Continue to advance on the implementation of the Action Plan on the Rule of Law, including as regards the Constitutional Tribunal: lack of legal proposals

Take forward the reform to separate the function of the Minister of Justice from that of the Prosecutor-General and to ensure functional independence of the prosecution service from the Government: lack of legal proposals

## II. Anti-Corruption Framework

---

*Where previous specific reports, published in the framework of the review under the UN Convention against Corruption, of GRECO, and of the OECD address the issues below, please make a reference to the points you wish to bring to the Commission's attention in these documents, indicating any relevant updates, changes or measures introduced that have occurred since these documents were published.*

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the anti-corruption framework (if applicable):

5000 character(s) maximum

A. The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption (prevention and investigation / prosecution)

List any **changes** as regards relevant authorities (e.g. national agencies, bodies) in charge of prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of corruption and the resources allocated to each of these authorities (the human, financial, legal, and technical/specialised resources as relevant), including the cooperation among domestic and with foreign authorities. Indicate any relevant measures taken to effectively and timely cooperate with OLAF and EPPO

5000 character(s) maximum

## Safeguards for the functional independence of the authorities tasked with the prevention and detection of corruption

5000 character(s) maximum

Information on the implementation of measures foreseen in the strategic anti-corruption framework (if applicable). If available, please provide relevant objectives and indicators

5000 character(s) maximum

### B. Prevention

Measures to enhance integrity in the public sector in particular as regards high-level officials (including as regards incompatibility rules, revolving doors, codes of conduct, ethics)

5000 character(s) maximum

Measures to enhance general transparency of public decision-making (including rules on lobbying, asset and interest disclosure rules, gifts policy, transparency of political party, financing)

5000 character(s) maximum

Measures to prevent conflicts of interest in the public sector. Please specify the features and scope of their application (e.g. categories of officials concerned, types of checks and corrective measures depending on the category of officials concerned)

5000 character(s) maximum

--> For the three previous points, **please also provide information and figures on their application /enforcement if available to you**, such as number of detected breaches/irregularities of the various rules in place and the follow-up given (investigations, sanctions, etc.)

Measures to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption, including their application (i.e. number of reports received, and the follow-up given)

5000 character(s) maximum

**[single market relevance]** Specific measures to enhance transparency, integrity and accountability in sectors with high risks of corruption, with a view to monitor and prevent corruption and conflict of interests, and where applicable measures to prevent and address corruption committed by organised crime groups.

- *Such high-risk sectors could include: public procurement, including construction, transport/infrastructure, defence, cohesion, agriculture, environment, healthcare, investor residence schemes, large-scale investments of national interest and the spending of EU funds, urban planning.*
- *In particular, measures to mitigate high risks of corruption in the area of public procurement, such as enhancing transparency and oversight (for example through digital technologies) and promoting fair competition and accountability in public procurement (e.g. targeted actions to address the high share of single bids) and measures to guarantee the effective and independent functioning of the public procurement review bodies.*

5000 character(s) maximum

**[single market relevance]** Measures for the prevention of corruption in relation to the issuing of official permits (e.g. related to environment, energy, service provision and various types of construction)

5000 character(s) maximum

## C. Repression

The legal framework on the criminalisation and sanctions for corruption and related offences, including foreign bribery

5000 character(s) maximum

Official data on the number of investigations, prosecutions, final judgments and the application of sanctions for corruption offences (differentiated by offence if possible). Please indicate whether the cases: involve legal persons; are related to the implementation of EU or national funds; involve high level corruption. Please indicate which data is publicly available and how policy-making is informed by the data

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Potential obstacles identified in law or in practice to the investigation and prosecution of high-level and complex corruption cases (e.g. political immunity regulation, procedural rules, statute of limitations, cross-border cooperation, pardoning)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Information on effectiveness of criminal and non-criminal measures and of sanctions (e.g. recovery measures and administrative sanctions) on both public and private offenders

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**Any other developments related to the anti-corruption framework - please specify**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

### III. Media pluralism and media freedom

---

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding media pluralism and media freedom (if applicable)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

#### A. Media authorities and bodies

Measures taken to ensure the independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources (financial, human and technical) of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Conditions and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head / members of the collegiate body of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Existence and functions of media councils or other self-regulatory bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Safeguards against government or political interference and transparency and concentration of media ownership

**[single market relevance]** Measures taken to ensure the fair and transparent allocation of state advertising

5000 character(s) maximum

Safeguards against state / political interference, in particular:

- safeguards to ensure editorial independence of media (private and public)
- specific safeguards for the independence of heads of management and members of the governing boards of public service media (e.g. related to appointment, dismissal), safeguards for their financial and operational independence (e.g. related to reporting obligations and the allocation of resources) and safeguards for plurality of information and opinions

- **[single market relevance]** information on specific legal provisions and procedures applying to media service providers, including as regards granting /renewal/termination of licenses, company operation, capital entry requirements, concentration and corporate governance

5000 character(s) maximum

**[single market relevance]** Transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information, including on direct, indirect and beneficial owners

5000 character(s) maximum

### C. Framework for journalists' protection, transparency and access to documents

Rules and practices guaranteeing journalists' independence and safety, including as regards protection of journalistic sources and communications, referring also, if applicable, to follow-up given to alerts lodged with the Council of Europe's Platform to promote the protection of journalism and safety of journalists

5000 character(s) maximum

Law enforcement capacity, including during protests and demonstrations, to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists

5000 character(s) maximum

Access to information and public documents by public at large and journalists (incl. transparency authorities where they exist, procedures, costs/fees, timeframes, administrative/judicial review of decisions, execution of decisions by public authorities, possible obstacles related to the classification of information)

5000 character(s) maximum

Lawsuits (incl. SLAPPs - strategic lawsuits against public participation) and convictions against journalists (incl. defamation cases) and measures taken to safeguard against manifestly unfounded and abusive lawsuits

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**Any other developments related to media pluralism and freedom - please specify**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

#### IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances

---

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the system of checks and balances (if applicable)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

##### A. The process for preparing, enacting and implementing laws

**[single market relevance]** Framework, policy and use of impact assessments and evidence based policy-making, stakeholders'\*/public consultations (including rules and practices on the transparent participation of civil society to policy development and decision-making processes), and transparency and quality of the legislative process in the preparatory, the parliamentary and implementation phase (including guidance on how to implement legislation)

*\* This includes also the consultation of social partners*

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**[single market relevance]** Rules and use of fast-track procedures and emergency procedures (for example, the percentage of decisions adopted through emergency /urgent procedure compared to the total number of adopted decisions)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

[ ]

**[single market relevance]** Safeguards to ensure legal certainty, the stability of the legal framework and non-discrimination.

5000 character(s) maximum

[ ]

Rules and application of states of emergency (or analogous regimes), including judicial review and parliamentary oversight

5000 character(s) maximum

[ ]

Regime for constitutional review of laws

5000 character(s) maximum

[ ]

## B. Independent authorities

Independence, resources, capacity and powers (including effective access to relevant data) of national human rights institutions ('NHRIs'), of ombudsman institutions if different from NHRIs, of equality bodies if different from NHRIs and of supreme audit institutions

(Cf. the website of the European Court of Auditors: <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/SupremeAuditInstitutions.aspx#>)

5000 character(s) maximum

[ ]

Statistics/reports concerning the follow-up to recommendations by National Human Rights Institutions, ombudsman institutions, equality bodies and supreme audit institutions in the past year

5000 character(s) maximum

[ ]

**[single market relevance]** Safeguards to ensure the effective independence of supervisory and regulatory authorities with a direct impact on economic operators such as national economic oversight, enforcement and competition authorities

[ ]

## C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

**[single market relevance]** Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and respect of the good administration principle (including the obligation of the administration to give reasons for decisions)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**[single market relevance]** Judicial review of administrative decisions: short description of the general regime (in particular competent court, scope, suspensive effect, interim measures, and any applicable specific rules or derogations from the general regime of judicial review)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**[single market relevance]** Safeguards (other than judicial review) regarding decisions or inaction of administrative authorities, including remedies (e.g. administrative review)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**[single market relevance]** Rules and practices related to the application by all courts, including constitutional jurisdictions, of the preliminary ruling procedure (Art. 267 TFEU)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**[single market relevance]** Implementation of final judgments by the public administration and State institutions and follow-up given to supranational judgments, including decisions from the European Court of Human Rights, as well as available remedies in case of non-implementation

*5000 character(s) maximum*

---

Oversight, including by courts, of the use of intrusive surveillance software by national authorities

*5000 character(s) maximum*

#### D. The enabling framework for civil society

Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. legal framework and its application in practice incl. registration, transparency and dissolution rules)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Rules and practices having an impact on the effective operation and safety of civil society organisations and human rights defenders. This includes measures to protect them from attacks – verbal, physical or on-line –, intimidation, legal threats incl. SLAPPs, negative narratives or smear campaigns, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc. It also includes measures to monitor threats or attacks and dedicated support services, as well as available remedies

*5000 character(s) maximum*

Organisation of financial support for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. framework to ensure access to funding, and for financial viability, taxation/incentive/donation systems, measures to ensure a fair distribution of funding)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

#### E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

If there have been developments related to initiatives to foster a rule of law culture, please specify, which (e.g. debates in national parliaments on the rule of law, public information campaigns on rule of law issues, contributions from civil society, education initiatives, etc.)

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**Any other developments related to the system of checks and balances - please specify**

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**Cross-pillar elements: cross-border rule of law issues related to the Single Market**

---

If there are any significant challenges concerning the Single Market you have been facing in a cross-border context relating to any of the four pillars of the report, including for example issues with market access and the conditions for economic activities, that you would like to highlight, please do so here.

*Given the cross-cutting nature of this question, it is included as a separate section in the questionnaire. Information collected under this question will however be integrated under the relevant existing pillar(s) of the Report.*

*5000 character(s) maximum*

**Supporting document upload**

---

If you would like to submit any supporting document(s) to your contribution, please upload your file(s) here

**Contact**

rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu

